

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 7, 12, 15, 21 and 26 have been amended and claims 5-6 and 19-20 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 7-18 and 21-42 remain pending in the application, of which claims 27-42 remain withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner objected to claims 1-26 on the basis that certain terms “appear” to lack antecedent basis, and that certain terms are not “clearly understood.” The Applicants traverse the rejection and offer the following to clarify the claim terminology.

As used in the claims, the phrases “gateway one of a plurality of access networks,” “target one of a plurality of access networks,” and “source one of a plurality of access networks” refer to specific ones of the plurality of access networks. In other words, there exists a plurality of access networks. The “gateway one” of that plurality of access networks is, therefore, a gateway access network. Similarly, the “target one” and “source one” refer to the target access network and source access network, respectively, of the plurality of networks. Therefore, the antecedent bases for “gateway access network,” “target access network” and “source access network” are, respectively, the claim elements “gateway one of a plurality of access networks,” “target one of a plurality of access networks,” and “source one of a plurality of access networks.” Similar clarifications apply to the Examiner’s assertion that the terms “the additional source network”¹ (claims 12 and 26) and “said additional gateway access network” (claim 13) lack antecedent basis.

¹ In claims 12 and 26, the term “additional source network” has been amended to “additional source access network” in order to clearly correspond to the antecedent terms.

3.) Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner object to claims 6-7 and 20-21 as dependent upon rejected base claims, but stated that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of any intervening claims. The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.


The Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 6 and intervening claim 5, and amended independent claim 15 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 20 and intervening claim 19. Accordingly, claims 1 and 15 are now allowable. Furthermore, whereas claims 2-4 and 7-14 are dependent from claim 1 and claims 16-18 and 21-26 are dependent from claim 15, and include the limitations of their respective base claims, those claims are also now allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-4, 7-18 and 21-26.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,


Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: February 22, 2006

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com